DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 164 EA 004 702

TITLE	Planning the Evaluation of Educators: A Simulation. Handbook for Conducting the Simulation (For Simulation Director Only).
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C. Div. of Instruction and Development.
PUB DATE	13 Mar 72
NOTE	76p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Sales Section, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (Stock No. 381-11996, no price quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Personnel; *Boards of Education; Citizen Participation; *Evaluation Methods; Lesson Observation Criteria; Role Playing; *Simulation; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This publication consists of (1) the Director's handbook for conducting the simulation of planning the evaluation of educators in a hypothetical Dover City School District setting, (2) role descriptions, (3) description and rules, (4) guidelines for planning, (5) reference materials, and (6) evaluation systems. The goal of this simulation is for the participants to experience (1) the positions and attitudes of persons who should make decisions about staff evaluation in a school district; (2) the major issues that must be considered in planning for evaluation; and (3) the selection, for application of instruments of evaluation that have been developed through research testing, and experience. The 4-hour simulation, designed for use in regional or local workshops, consists of two planning sessions, a critique session, and a concluding discussion. Participants should include teachers, administrators, school board members, parents, and teachers enacting roles different from their real life positions. (Author/JF)

A Simulation

A National Education Association Publication

ED 070164

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NEA

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright 1972
National Education Association of the United States
All Rights Reserved

NEA Stock Number 381-11996

Order the AV Companion to...

The Evaluation of Educators: A Simulation

A brief filmstrip-tape presentation to help the director orient the role-players to their hypothetical Dover City School District setting and situation.

24-frame color filmstrip
Taped narration (reel, 7 1/2 ips)
Printed script
$15 (Stock #388-11942)

(cut here)

ORDER FORM

Mail to: NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
Publication-Sales Section 175
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Rush to me ____ copy(ies) of THE EVALUATION OF EDUCATORS: A SIMULATION filmstrip-tape presentation at $15.00 each. Stock #388-11942. Quantity discounts: 2-9 copies, 10%; 10 or more, 20%.

_____
name

_____
address

_____
city/state/zip

___ *Payment enclosed.* ___ *Bill on purchase order attached. Total $*_____

Payment must accompany all orders except for those on your official institutional purchase order forms. For fastest service, be sure to attach this form and include stock numbers when ordering. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed purchase orders.

PLANNING THE EVALUATION OF EDUCATORS
—A SIMULATION

HANDBOOK FOR CONDUCTING THE SIMULATION
(For Simulation Director Only)

Division of Instruction and Professional Development
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1201 - 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Copyright© 1972/National Education Association of the United States/All Rights Reserved
NEA Stock Number 381-11996

FOREWORD

It is difficult to grasp the reality of complex issues without suffering the consequences that trial and error frequently produce. And the ability to verbalize an idea or understand it intellectually is sometimes insufficient for making wise decisions and effecting appropriate action. That is why simulation may be an invention which grows out of necessity. It promises to make possible the gaining of wisdom for decision making through feeling and experiencing near-reality without suffering the consequences of errors made in the process.

Since a main activity in this simulation is role playing, there may be persons to whom it does not appear accommodating on first consideration. Some feel uncomfortable about "play acting." Such discomfort may harken back even to the stage fright of high school and college drama experience. But the simulation experience is actually quite different. The roles to be played are those of persons who very much affect the professional lives of those playing them. Thus, the first flush of self-consciousness soon gives way to expressing modes of thinking and feeling so internalized through experience that they fairly cry to be let out. If you are one who has not taken kindly to playing a role, give this particular use of it a chance. We think you will be pleased you did. You will want to bear in mind several questions as you go through it:

Is this a better way to get the feel of the goals, criteria, and processes of evaluation than by listening to a lecture or reading a position paper?

How useful will the insights gained through this experience be to local teachers associations in planning for and becoming involved in evaluation?

What contribution can it make to achieving more cooperative efforts among all parties concerned in the development and application of programs of evaluation?

New ways of learning for children and youth that reflect realism and meaningfulness are being advocated and developed all across the land. Here is a promising means for educators to learn more about one of the most pressing issues in American education.

Acknowledgment is made to Dr. Ash Hartwell, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, whose research and development contributed in a major way to the preparation of this simulation. Both the Michigan Education Association and the St. Louis (Missouri) Suburban Teachers Association provided situations for gathering material on and testing out concepts that were later incorporated in the simulation.

Bernard McKenna

INTRODUCTION

Simulation is a relatively recent technique for examining social processes and issues. Broadly defined, it is a condensed representation of a real-world situation. By experiencing significant aspects of a process that occurs in real life, participants in the simulation become involved directly with the issues that must be understood in order for change to occur.

The subject of this simulation—the evaluation of educators—is a process currently of vital concern to teachers and school administrators. Most staff evaluation procedures in use in schools today fail to adequately measure competence. Surveys show that over 60 percent of the nation's educators have little confidence that these procedures are objective or helpful.

To improve evaluation, educators must be aware of attitudes, issues, and research that suggest new approaches. It is the primary goal of this simulation for participants to experience:

1. The positions and attitudes of persons who should make decisions about staff evaluation in a school district.

2. The major issues that must be considered in planning for evaluation.

3. The selection, for application, of instruments of evaluation that have been developed through research, testing, and try-out.

CONDITIONS FOR CONDUCTING THE SIMULATION

The simulation on "Planning the Evaluation of Educators" has been designed for use in regional and local workshops where evaluation is a major focus. Because it assumes that participants have some familiarity with at least one of the formal methods of assessing the behavior of educators (such as Interaction Analysis or Thirty-Three Roles for Teachers and Students), the simulation is best conducted following presentations that ensure such familiarity.

The simulation itself consists of two planning sessions, a critique session, and a concluding discussion. A minimum of about 4 hours should be allowed for running it, beyond the time needed for preliminary presentations and instructions. If all eight roles are used (see p. 5), more time will be needed. Since the two major

sessions—the planning sessions—are of considerable length and intensity, it is recommended that one be conducted in the morning and the other in the afternoon. If scheduled in other ways, a substantial break—at least 20 minutes—should be provided between the two sessions.

PARTICIPANTS AND FORMAT

Ideally, teachers, administrators, school board members, parents, and students should all be involved in the simulation, enacting roles different from their real-life positions. This "role reversal" is designed to allow them to examine perspectives objectively and to lead them toward better cooperation and understanding following the simulation.

The simulation has a committee format. Depending on their number, the participants are organized into one or more groups, each group being the Evaluation Planning Committee for the hypothetical Dover City School District. Each committee can have a maximum of eight members. If a full day is available, all eight roles may be used. When only about 4 hours are allotted, two or three roles should be removed (see Item 4(e) on p. 6).

Each committee should be as heterogeneous as possible. It is suggested that the Simulation Director plan ahead, insofar as possible, for each group to be made up of persons who represent a variety of positions held in real life.

Where there is more than one committee, committees should be paired in readiness for the next-to-last activity in the simulation wherein they are to make presentations to and critiques of their opposite number (see p. 7).

SETTING, RESOURCES, AND MATERIALS

The simulation should be conducted in a room large enough to accommodate all participants. For each committee there should be a large table around which the members are seated. During the exercise, coffee, water, and other refreshments add to the reality and comfort of the situation.

A screen, a filmstrip projector, and a tape recorder are needed for the film-tape presentation on Dover City.

For each committee there should be one set of "Role Descriptors" (eight yellow sheets) and one "Summary Report of Proposed Evaluation Plan" (goldenrod sheet).

Copies of the following pamphlets need to be available for each committee member:

I. Description and Rules (blue)
II. Guidelines for Planning (buff)
    - Goals
    - Criteria
    - Personnel Involvement
    - Data Sources

III. Reference Materials (pink)
    - Goals and Philosophy of Dover City School District
    - Dover City Teachers Association Policy Statement on Teacher Evaluation
    - Contract Statement on Evaluation Committee
    - Current Evaluation Procedures
    - Classroom Observation Form
    - Teacher Evaluation Check Sheet

IV. Evaluation Systems (green)

The Simulation Director should have at hand a full set of the printed materials for his reference throughout the exercise.

Committee monitors—one for every 2-4 groups—should be selected and briefed by the Director before the simulation begins. The monitors' main responsibility is to see that the committees move from one task to another within a reasonable period of time so that they do not lag behind in reaching the decisions required in each session. In situations where there are only a few committees at work, the committee chairmen can function as monitors.

STEPS TO BE FOLLOWED IN CONDUCTING THE SIMULATION

Introduction and General Instructions
(45 minutes)

1. As participants enter the room, give each of them copies of the pamphlets entitled "I. Description and Rules" and "II. Guidelines for Planning." Do not distribute other materials at this time. Allow participants a maximum of 15 minutes to read the pamphlets.
2. Also as they enter, direct participants to tables according to plan.
3. Review with participants the essentials of the simulation as outlined in

"I. Descriptions and Rules":

a. Purpose of the exercise.

b. Structure and timing. (Emphasize that much is to be accomplished in a short time. Participants sometimes consider this a severe handicap, but it is often typical of the real-world situation.)

c. The addressing of participants by their "new names" as members of the Evaluation Planning Committee. (Provide name tags or easel-backed or folded place cards and crayon or felt pen so participants can display their role names.)

The eight role names for members of the Evaluation Planning Committee and their titles are:

Mrs. Conklin, Member, Board of Education
Mrs. Dickenson, English Teacher, Dover City Junior High School; Vice-President of Dover City Teachers Association
Mr. Glass, Head, Science Department, Dover City Senior High School
Miss Newman, Committee Chairman; Mathematics Teacher, Dover City Middle School
Mr. Phelps, Member, Board of Education
Mr. Poli, Recorder; Elementary School Teacher
Mr. Poole, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Personnel
Mr. Schnaps, Principal, Dover City Senior High School

4. Distribute sets of "Role Descriptors" to tables and have participants decide on their roles as committee members. Some ground rules to observe in this process are:

a. Participants should select roles with which they have some familiarity but which are different in perspective from those they play in real life. Under no circumstances should a participant play a role identical to the one he currently plays in real life.

b. Begin with the role of the committee chairman, Miss Newman. Try to identify a person with group process skills to play this role. In some situations, it may be possible for the Simulation Director to identify non-directive leader types for this role before the simulation begins.

c. A man can select a woman's role and a woman a man's role. Change the prefixes (Mr., Mrs., Miss) accordingly.

d. Although some participants may feel they cannot role-play, assure them that their uncertainty will disappear once the exercise is under way (see foreword to "I. Description and Rules").

e. If there are fewer than eight participants in the group(s), eliminate roles in the following order: Mrs. Conklin, Mr. Glass, Mr. Schnaps.

5. At the same time, distribute copies of the pamphlet entitled "III. Reference Materials" but do not at this point give participants time to read it. Also distribute for each recorder a "Summary Report..." sheet (goldenrod).
6. Show the filmstrip.

Planning Session I
Goals, Criteria, Involvement, Data
(1 hour, 30 minutes)

1. At the beginning of this session, the chairman (Miss Newman) of each committee should take over and announce that the committee has 15 minutes to study materials. When this is completed, the members should introduce themselves by role names and say a few words about their point of view as outlined in the role descriptors. The committee should then move immediately into discussion. They should continue to discuss and make decisions throughout the entire session, moving through the four tasks outlined in "II. Guidelines for Planning": selecting goals, determining criteria, determining who should select and apply specific systems, and identifying sources of data. The recorder should note decisions on the "Summary Report..." sheet for reference during the second planning session and for making his report in the critique session. Whenever the committee cannot reach a consensus, a vote is required. Each member, except the chairman, has one vote. Dissenting views, if held by more than one member, should be recorded and reported.
2. During Session I, do not intervene. If a committee chairman is not following instructions, coach him privately and unobtrusively.
3. Committee monitors should move among their assigned tables during this session, noting the progress in reaching decisions on the four tasks. If a committee works 45 minutes on Task 1, the monitor should quietly remind the chairman, with as little interruption as possible to the committee, that there are three more tasks to be performed in the remaining 45 minutes. At the end of 1 hour, the monitors should remind committee chairmen that they have 30 minutes to complete the four tasks.

4. At the end of 1 hour, 30 minutes, announce to committees that the first session is to be concluded. A minimum 20-minute break should be allowed. A comfortable schedule would allow for lunch at this point.

Planning Session II
(1 hour, 30 minutes)

1. When the group reconvenes for the second session, distribute the pamphlet entitled "IV. Evaluation Systems" and restate the purposes of the simulation.
2. Remind chairmen that each committee member should study and assess one of the evaluation systems outlined in the pamphlet and then describe to the rest of the committee its (a) process, (b) cost, (c) time requirements, and (d) appropriateness. Each instrument must be assessed using the four decisions from Session I as criteria of its appropriateness. The committee should then select no more than two instruments for use in evaluating Dover City educators.
3. At the end of 1 hour, 30 minutes, conclude Session II.
4. If there is only one committee, omit the Reciprocal Critique Session (see below) and move directly into the Concluding Discussion (p. 8).

Reciprocal Critique Session
(30 minutes)

1. For this session, committees should be paired and each pair of tables moved together so they are in an interface relationship.
2. Announce that the session will be divided into two 15-minute segments so that critiques of the work of both committees will be accomplished. In the first segment, the recorder for one committee will give a 3-minute report on decisions arrived at in Session I on the four tasks and on the instrument(s) selected in Planning Session II, including rationale for the selection. The "Summary Report..." (goldenrod sheet) will be useful for this purpose.
3. The opposite-number committee should then raise questions in such a way that the other committee is caused to defend its decisions and instrument selection.
4. Call time at 15 minutes and repeat the procedure, with the second committee giving its report and the first committee raising questions.

5. At the end of 30 minutes, announce that the critique is concluded.

Concluding Discussion
(30 minutes)

1. In this final activity, lead the discussion by raising questions such as the following:
   a. What general problems were there in reaching decisions?
   b. What specific issues created the most disagreement?
   c. What kind of preparation for a real-life planning activity might alleviate some of these difficulties?
   d. Of what use will insights gained here be for a real-life planning program?
   e. What implications for negotiation were gained from the experience?
   f. From the issues discussed and the conclusions reached, what would be appropriate content to consider for negotiated master agreements between teachers and school boards?
2. Allow 15 or 20 minutes for participants to respond to the questions raised.
3. Spend the last 10 minutes of the simulation exploring the use that might be made of learnings gained through this experience. Such issues as the following might be suggested to participants for follow-up:
   a. Constituting a committee in the local school system.
   b. Formulating appropriate time-line for planning.
   c. Adopting or adapting the four areas in "II. Guidelines for Planning."
   d. Identifying resource persons.
   e. Collecting samples of instruments and analyzing them in light of earlier decisions (goals, criteria, etc.).
   f. Adopting, adapting, or developing final instrumentation.
4. Call to the attention of the participants that this simulation has not provided for training in the application of instruments, actual application, interpretation, and prescription of action—e.g., in-service, change of status—based on the

findings. These important aspects of evaluation will need to be planned through a variety of additional projects and activities.

FACILITIES, MEDIA, AND MATERIALS FOR CONDUCTING THE SIMULATION

1. Room set up with tables for seating eight persons. Round tables are preferable.
2. Filmstrip projector and screen.
3. Tape recorder.
4. Blackboard, or easel with newsprint.
5. Eight 5x8 easel-backed (or other type) cards and a wax crayon or felt pen on each table.
6. Coffee service and pitchers of water in or near the room.
7. Microphone, preferably neck type, for the Simulation Director.

CHECKLIST FOR SIMULATION DIRECTOR

( ) 1. Distribute copies of pamphlets I (blue) and II (buff) as participants are directed to tables. Allow 15 minutes for reading.

( ) 2. Introduce simulation: purposes, structure, timing, roles.

( ) 3. Distribute role descriptors (yellow), copies of pamphlet III (pink), and summary report sheet (goldenrod) to tables.

( ) 4. Explain and supervise role selection.

( ) 5. Introduce and show filmstrip.

( ) 6. Give special instructions to committee chairmen and turn over direction to them for Planning Session I — 1 hour, 30 minutes (may vary).

( ) 7. Observe proceedings and coach as necessary.

( ) 8. Announce conclusion of first session and break time allowed.

( ) 9. Reopen simulation, review purposes, and distribute copies of pamphlet IV (green) to tables.

( ) 10. Give special instructions to committee chairmen and turn over direction to them for Planning Session II — 1 hour, 30 minutes.

( ) 11. Observe proceedings and coach as necessary.

( ) 12. Announce conclusion of second session. Direct preparation and give instructions on procedure for half-hour critique session and have first committee begin report.

( ) 13. At 15 minutes, call time on first report/critique and have committees switch procedure.

( ) 14. At 30 minutes, announce conclusion of critique session. Introduce and lead concluding session: raise questions for discussion and explore follow-up activities according to guidelines on pages 8-9 of this handbook.

( ) 15. Conclude meeting.

Planning the Evaluation of Educators:
A Simulation

Role Descriptor

MISS NEWMAN, Committee Chairman
Mathematics Teacher (Tenured)
Dover City Middle School

You are a mathematics teacher at Dover City Middle School, with eight years of experience in teaching. You were asked by the Dover City Teachers Association to serve on the Evaluation Planning Committee to provide the perspective of the tenured teacher in the school district.

You are currently on the tenure committee of Dover City Middle School, which makes recommendations to the principal on those teachers who should be awarded tenure. Although you believe that teachers should be responsible for these decisions, you are uncomfortable with the current system, as it is perceived by new teachers as quite threatening and subjective. Also, because time for observations and conferences is limited, the benefits of the current evaluation system are limited. You hope that a new plan will more adequately provide support for new teachers and also involve more teachers in setting up criteria and procedures for staff evaluation.

You were elected by the Evaluation Planning Committee as its chairman. For the planning meeting, a number of steps are recommended to you as chairman in order to facilitate the discussion and decision making:

1. You have 1 hour, 30 minutes for the first planning session. Allow about 15 minutes following the showing of the filmstrip for participants to study the materials.

2. Have all participants introduce themselves by committee role name and position and say a few words about their point of view as outlined in the role descriptors. They should be addressed by their role names throughout the planning sessions.

3. Make a very brief opening statement about the task of the Evaluation Planning Committee, which is to prepare an interim report to the Board of Education and the Teachers Association on a recommended teacher evaluation plan for Dover City.

4. Have members of the group refer to "II. Guidelines for Planning" and begin immediately to work through the four tasks of these guidelines. (It is recommended that you limit discussion on the first task, "Goals," to 30 minutes.)

5. Whenever the group appears to be deadlocked, a vote can be called for. Each member, except the chairman, has one vote. The Committee will abide by the majority position, though a record of dissenting views, if held by more than one dissenter, should be made for the final report.

6. In the second planning session, each participant should select (or you as chairman should assign to each member) from pamphlet IV one of the evaluation systems for analysis and reporting to the rest of the Committee. His analysis should be based on decisions made during the first planning session. The Committee should then select no more than two instruments for use in evaluating Dover City educators. This session should not exceed 1 hour, 30 minutes.

7. Mr. Poli will make a record of the major decisions of the Committee for the final report.

As in the real world, your views and positions on the issues under discussion may change from the initial positions suggested by your role.

Members of the Evaluation Planning Committee

Mrs. Conklin, Member, Board of Education
Mrs. Dickenson, English Teacher, Dover City Junior High School; Vice-President of Dover City Teachers Association
Mr. Glass, Head, Science Department, Dover City Senior High School
Miss Newman, Committee Chairman; Mathematics Teacher, Dover City Middle School
Mr. Phelps, Member, Board of Education
Mr. Poli, Recorder; Elementary School Teacher
Mr. Poole, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Personnel
Mr. Schnaps, Principal, Dover City Senior High School

(Revised December 1971)

Copyright © 1972
National Education Association of the U.S.

Planning the Evaluation of Educators: A Simulation

Role Descriptor

MR. POLI, Recorder
Elementary School Teacher (Probationary)

You are a new teacher in a Dover City elementary school and were asked by the Dover City Teachers Association to serve on the Evaluation Planning Committee to provide the perspective of new teachers in the district.

Although there is no question in your mind that you will be given tenure after the mandatory three-year probationary period, you are not confident that the evaluation material in your personnel folder adequately describes your strengths. Further, you feel that the observations and conferences which are part of the current evaluation process do not provide any real help to you. (In December, when you were attempting a new class grouping procedure that was causing some confusion, the observer simply noted the confusion and assumed you were weak in classroom management skills.) Some reading you have done suggests why this is so:

> The common sense assumption holds that telling an individual where he is falling down will provide effective motivation to get him to change. This assumption is negated by research. Contrast the situation in which a subordinate is evaluating his own performance relative to specific targets which he set a few months ago to the situation in which he is listening to his superior evaluate his performance against the superior's standards and objectives.
>
> In this latter case, the stage is set for rationalization, defensiveness, inability to understand, reactions that the supervisor is being unfair or arbitrary. These are not conditions conducive to effective motivation.
>
> The conclusion of many studies on supervision based on criteria external to the person supervised is that it does not facilitate individual growth and development, but rather militates against it.

You feel that this finding must be considered in planning a teacher evaluation process. You would be most in favor of a plan that allowed you to set your own objectives and then be evaluated on how well you met them.

You are responsible for keeping a record of the major decisions of the Com-

mittee for the final report. The "Summary Report..." (goldenrod sheet) will be useful for this.

As in the real world, your views and positions on the issues under discussion may change from the initial positions suggested by your role.

Rules

1. Address other participants by their role names.
2. When a vote is required to settle an issue, you have one vote. The committee will abide by the majority position, though a record of dissenting views, if held by more than one dissenter, may be made in the final report.

Members of the Evaluation Planning Committee

Mrs. Conklin, Member, Board of Education
Mrs. Dickenson, English Teacher, Dover City Junior High School; Vice-President of Dover City Teachers Association
Mr. Glass, Head, Science Department, Dover City Senior High School
Miss Newman, Committee Chairman; Mathematics Teacher, Dover City Middle School
Mr. Phelps, Member, Board of Education
Mr. Poli, Recorder; Elementary School Teacher
Mr. Poole, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Personnel
Mr. Schnaps, Principal, Dover City Senior High School

Copyright © 1972
National Education Association of the U.S.

Planning the Evaluation of Educators: A Simulation

Role Descriptor

MR. POOLE
Assistant Superintendent
Dover City School District

You are the assistant superintendent of the Dover City School District, in charge of personnel and budget. The superintendent asked the Board of Education to appoint you to the Evaluation Planning Committee.

As assistant superintendent, one of your principal responsibilities includes screening and recommending applicants for teaching positions. You feel that a new evaluation system would enable you to make better decisions if it provided objective information on the performance of newly appointed personnel. You would also like to see outstanding teachers rewarded and are seeking a way of determining who these teachers are. You recently completed a survey in which you compared your rating of candidates for teaching jobs against the supervisory ratings of these same teachers after they had been teaching in Dover City for a year. The results were disturbing: there was only a .20 correlation between the two judgments. This suggests that either you are using criteria in assessing teachers that are quite different from criteria used by the supervisors in the District, or different judgments on the same criteria are highly unreliable.

The superintendent has not set a budget limitation for the evaluation plan, but you know he is willing to recommend a budget of up to $7000 for a plan that incorporates in-service training provisions.

As in the real world, you views and positions on the issues under discussion may change from the initial positions suggested by your role.

Rules

1. Address other participants by their role names.

2. When a vote is required to settle an issue, you have one vote. The Committee will abide by the majority position, though a record of dissenting views, if held by more than one dissenter, may be made in the final report.

Members of the Evaluation Planning Committee

Mrs. Conklin, Member, Board of Education
Mrs. Dickenson, English Teacher, Dover City Junior High School; Vice-President of Dover City Teachers Association
Mr. Glass, Head, Science Department, Dover City Senior High School
Miss Newman, Committee Chairman; Mathematics Teacher, Dover City Middle School
Mr. Phelps, Member, Board of Education
Mr. Poli, Recorder; Elementary School Teacher
Mr. Poole, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Personnel
Mr. Schnaps, Principal, Dover City Senior High School

Copyright © 1972
National Education Association of the U.S.

Planning the Evaluation of Educators: A Simulation

Role Descriptor

MR. PHELPS
Member of the Board of Education
Dover City School District

You are a member of the Board of Education in Dover City. As an elected official, you feel it is your responsibility to speak for those who voted for you.

As a successful executive in industry, you are appalled at the primitive methods of evaluation in the Dover schools. You believe that Dover City should have more adequate information about what the goals of the schools are and that staff should be evaluated on their ability to achieve those goals. It is the responsibility of the schools to implement the goals and demonstrate how teachers are meeting them in a systematic way. You believe that an evaluation plan might help achieve this. You have been doing some background reading on teacher evaluation and have been surprised to find that the assumption made by most evaluation procedures (including those now in use in Dover City) that "school administrators are capable of determining the important qualities, behaviors, and skills of an effective teacher" is not true. This does not imply that administrators are incompetent but that the procedures of teacher evaluation are too crude to produce satisfactory results.

A second finding you have come across is that there is a relationship between student evaluation of a teacher and the teacher's effectiveness in raising student achievement.

At a recent series of hearings that the Board conducted with the community, the following concerns were articulated by a large number of citizens:

1. While the community does not need to be involved in the process of evaluating schools and teachers, it should be given a clear explanation of the processes used, and these should be directly related to overall school policy and goals.

2. Although costs are going up at an alarming rate, there should be a greater effort to assess what the schools are accomplishing, and this should be communicated regularly to the community.

As in the real world, your views and positions on the issues under discussion may change from the initial positions suggested by your role.

Rules

1. Address other participants by their role names.

2. When a vote is required to settle an issue, you have one vote. The Committee will abide by the majority position, though a record of dissenting views, if held by more than one dissenter, may be made in the final report.

Members of the Evaluation Planning Committee

Mrs. Conklin, Member, Board of Education
Mrs. Dickenson, English Teacher, Dover City Junior High School; Vice-President of Dover City Teachers Association
Mr. Glass, Head, Science Department, Dover City Senior High School
Miss Newman, Committee Chairman; Mathematics Teacher, Dover City Middle School
Mr. Phelps, Member, Board of Education
Mr. Poli, Recorder; Elementary School Teacher
Mr. Poole, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Personnel
Mr. Schnaps, Principal, Dover City Senior High School

Copyright © 1972
National Education Association of the U.S.

Planning the Evaluation of Educators: A Simulation

Role Descriptor

MRS. DICKENSON
English Teacher, Dover City Junior High School
Vice-President of Dover City Teachers Association

As an elected official of the Dover City Teachers Association and the Association's appointed representative to the Evaluation Planning Committee, you feel it is your responsibility to gain a full hearing for the Association's views.

As the Association sees it, the major issue in evaluation is that professional teachers must be given greater responsibility for evaluating their own performance; its major function is to facilitate the process of personal and professional growth. It is clear to you that currently there are no universal objective criteria or techniques for assessing teacher performance and that the importance of humanism and individuality in the classroom would be minimized by a procedure which measures performance against only those behaviors that can be measured objectively.

One of the Association's considerations in teacher evaluation is research that indicates there is little or no relationship between the processes teachers use and student achievement. Studies that have demonstrated this have advocated the development of new methods of teacher evaluation. Criteria that have been developed for an effective process of teacher evaluation include:

1. There should be agreement between administrator and teacher on precisely what is to be evaluated and the means of evaluation.
2. Teachers must be given support and assistance to meet objectives specified and agreed upon.
3. Evaluation must be based on performance, not on personality.
4. Evaluation should be future-oriented and cumulative so that the process contributes to the growth and development of the teacher.

In a survey conducted last school year it was found that over 60 percent of the teachers questioned had little or no confidence in the current system of evaluation.

As in the real world, your views and positions on the issues under discussion may change from the initial positions suggested by your role.

Rules

1. Address other participants by their role names.

2. When a vote is required to settle an issue, you have one vote. The Committee will abide by the majority position, though a record of dissenting views, if held by more than one dissenter, may be made in the final report.

Members of the Evaluation Planning Committee

Mrs. Conklin, Member, Board of Education
Mrs. Dickenson, English Teacher, Dover City Junior High School; Vice-President of Dover City Teachers Association
Mr. Glass, Head, Science Department, Dover City Senior High School
Miss Newman, Committee Chairman; Mathematics Teacher, Dover City Middle School
Mr. Phelps, Member, Board of Education
Mr. Poli, Recorder; Elementary School Teacher
Mr. Poole, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Personnel
Mr. Schnaps, Principal, Dover City Senior High School

Copyright © 1972
National Education Association of the U.S.

(Role deletion #3)

Planning the Evaluation of Educators:
A Simulation

Role Descriptor

MR. SCHNAPS
Principal
Dover City Senior High School

You are the principal of Dover City Senior High School. You were asked by the superintendent to serve on the Evaluation Planning Committee to ensure that the plan adopted will be acceptable to you.

You believe that, on the whole, your teachers are of excellent quality and you do not wish to introduce an evaluation plan that will upset your good relations with the staff. Your major responsibilities in teacher evaluation include:

1. Making recommendations to the superintendent on personnel promotion, transfer, and dismissal.

2. Making staff assignments to teaching posts.

3. Recommending in-service activities to improve instruction.

You hope that the plan adopted will provide your staff means of self-improvement and more opportunities to interact. But you also are anxious to have more objective information to back up your personnel recommendations. One of the findings in the area of teacher evaluation that has come to your attention recently is a survey of research literature that shows conclusively that supervisory ratings of teachers lack reliability and validity. It has been demonstrated over and over again that there is little agreement among supervisors on the evaluation of a classroom teacher's performance, and that whatever agreement does exist is not related to student achievement.

As in the real world, your views and positions on the issues under discussion may change from the initial positions suggested by your role.

Rules

1. Address other participants by their role names.

2. When a vote is required to settle an issue, you have one vote. The Committee will abide by the majority position, though a record of dissenting views, if held by more than one dissenter, may be made in the final report.

Members of the Evaluation Planning Committee

Mrs. Conklin, Member, Board of Education
Mrs. Dickenson, English Teacher, Dover City Junior High School; Vice-President of Dover City Teachers Association
Mr. Glass, Head, Science Department, Dover City Senior High School
Miss Newman, Committee Chairman; Mathematics Teacher, Dover City Middle School
Mr. Phelps, Member, Board of Education
Mr. Poli, Recorder; Elementary School Teacher
Mr. Poole, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Personnel
Mr. Schnaps, Principal, Dover City Senior High School

Copyright © 1972
National Education Association of the U.S.

(Role deletion #2)

Planning the Evaluation of Educators:
A Simulation

Role Descriptor

MR. GLASS
Head, Department of Science
Dover City Senior High School

You are the head of the second largest department in Dover City Senior High School and are responsible for supervising the eight science teachers. You were asked by the Dover City Teachers Association to serve on the Evaluation Planning Committee to provide the perspective of a senior supervisory staff member.

Your department has recently adopted curriculum materials that specify very clearly the objectives for all science courses. You are in a position to know which teachers are effective in getting students to attain these objectives and which are not. As an educator primarily concerned with student learning, you feel that this is an excellent base for a teacher evaluation plan, particularly insofar as that plan would allow for new teachers to get adequate supervisory support. Your view is that teacher evaluation should demonstrate the effectiveness of the teacher in getting students to achieve objectives and that other criteria are not appropriate.

In your reading of literature on supervision of teachers, one of the findings that confirms your own experience is that the value orientation of the observer has more influence on his judgment of the teacher's performance than any other factor. If a supervisor believes in an open classroom, he will rate a tightly structured class procedure low; if he believes students need a lot of structure to learn, he will criticize the open, spontaneous teacher. You believe this finding must be considered in formulating an adequate plan of teacher evaluation.

As in the real world, your views and positions on the issues under discussion may change from the initial positions suggested by your role.

Rules

1. Address other participants by their role names.

2. When a vote is required to settle an issue, you have one vote. The Committee will abide by the majority position, though a record of dissenting views, if held by more than one dissenter, may be made in the final report.

Members of the Evaluation Planning Committee

Mrs. Conklin, Member, Board of Education
Mrs. Dickenson, English Teacher, Dover City Junior High School; Vice-President of Dover City Teachers Association
Mr. Glass, Head, Science Department, Dover City Senior High School
Miss Newman, Committee Chairman; Mathematics Teacher, Dover City Middle School
Mr. Phelps, Member, Board of Education
Mr. Poli, Recorder; Elementary School Teacher
Mr. Poole, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Personnel
Mr. Schnaps, Principal, Dover City Senior High School

Copyright © 1972
National Education Association of the U.S.

(Role deletion #1)

Planning the Evaluation of Educators:
A Simulation

Role Descriptor

MRS. CONKLIN
Member of the Board of Education
Dover City School District

You are a member of the Board of Education in Dover City. As an elected official, you feel it is your responsibility to speak for those who voted for you.

You feel that the taxpayers of Dover City are concerned about the quality of the teachers in the district and that the schools should be more responsible for eliminating incompetent staff. You are aware that charges of incompetency must be well-documented and advocate a procedure for evaluation which will make such charges incontestable.

You are aware of the experiments in performance contracting with private industry that are being adopted by some school systems. You believe the citizens of Dover City might support this idea, though they would prefer a program within the schools which would demonstrate exactly how effective teachers are in promoting student learning.

As in the real world, your views and positions on the issues under discussion may change from the initial positions suggested by your role.

Rules

1. Address participants by their role names.

2. When a vote is required to settle an issue, you have one vote. The Committee will abide by the majority position, though a record of dissenting views, if held by more than one dissenter, may be made in the final report.

Members of the Evaluation Planning Committee
Mrs. Conklin, Member, Board of Education
Mrs. Dickenson, English Teacher, Dover City Junior High School; Vice-President of Dover City Teachers Association
Mr. Glass, Head, Science Department, Dover City Senior High School

Miss Newman, Committee Chairman; Mathematics Teacher, Dover City Middle School
Mr. Phelps, Member, Board of Education
Mr. Poli, Recorder; Elementary School Teacher
Mr. Poole, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Personnel
Mr. Schnaps, Principal, Dover City Senior High School

Copyright © 1972
National Education Association of the U.S.

PLANNING THE EVALUATION OF EDUCATORS —A SIMULATION

I. DESCRIPTION AND RULES

Division of Instruction and Professional Development
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1201 - 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Copyright© 1972/National Education Association of the United States/All Rights Reserved
NEA Stock Number 381-11996

FOREWORD

It is difficult to grasp the reality of complex issues without suffering the consequences that trial and error frequently produce. And the ability to verbalize an idea or understand it intellectually is sometimes insufficient for making wise decisions and effecting appropriate action. That is why simulation may be an invention which grows out of necessity. It promises to make possible the gaining of wisdom for decision making through feeling and experiencing near-reality without suffering the consequences of errors made in the process.

Since a main activity in this simulation is role playing, there may be persons to whom it does not appear accommodating on first consideration. Some feel uncomfortable about "play acting." Such discomfort may harken back even to the stage fright of high school and college drama experience. But the simulation experience is actually quite different. The roles to be played are those of persons who very much affect the professional lives of those playing them. Thus, the first flush of self-consciousness soon gives way to expressing modes of thinking and feeling so internalized through experience that they fairly cry to be let out. If you are one who has not taken kindly to playing a role, give this particular use of it a chance. We think you will be pleased you did. You will want to bear in mind several questions as you go through it:

- Is this a better way to get the feel of the goals, criteria, and processes of evaluation than by listening to a lecture or reading a position paper?
- How useful will the insights gained through this experience be to local teachers associations in planning for and becoming involved in evaluation?
- What contribution can it make to achieving more cooperative efforts among all parties concerned in the development and application of programs of evaluation?

New ways of learning for children and youth that reflect realism and meaningfulness are being advocated and developed all across the land. Here is a promising means for educators to learn more about one of the most pressing issues in American education.

Bernard McKenna

INTRODUCTION

A simulation is an operating model of a physical or social process. A social science simulation, for example, permits participants to develop insights into social processes without having to experiment with the real world.

"Planning the Evaluation of Educators" is a 4-5 hour simulation in which participants assume the roles of members of a planning committee to work out basic guidelines for a professional staff evaluation system in a hypothetical school system (Dover City School District) and to select instruments that reflect the agreed-upon guidelines. The main purpose of the exercise is to gain better understanding of the complex issues that must be considered in planning evaluation programs and to explore the implications of commitment to various goals and assumptions on the choice of specific systems.

HOW THE SIMULATION WORKS

Following brief orientation by the Simulation Director, which includes study by participants of basic reference materials, participants will be asked to assume roles as members of the hypothetical Evaluation Planning Committee for the Dover City School System. The roles are as follows:

Mrs. Conklin, Member, Board of Education
Mrs. Dickenson, English Teacher, Dover City Junior High School; Vice-President of Dover City Teachers Association
Mr. Glass, Head, Science Department, Dover City Senior High School
Miss Newman, Committee Chairman; Mathematics Teacher, Dover City Middle School
Mr. Phelps, Member, Board of Education
Mr. Poli, Recorder; Elementary School Teacher
Mr. Poole, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Personnel
Mr. Schnaps, Principal, Dover City Senior High School

The Simulation Director will help in the assignment of roles. A one-page "Role Descriptor" provides each participant assuming a role with a description of the position he holds and something of his point of view on education and evaluation.

Once roles are assumed, participants will not get out of role (except for the break) until the critique begins. Participants will wear name tags or have cards

in front of them bearing their role names and will be referred to by role names throughout Planning Sessions I and II.

Following the role designation, a filmstrip will be shown orienting participants to Dover City and its school system, after which the simulation will formally begin and proceed through the sessions described next.

Planning Session I

Goals, Criteria, Involvement, Data
(1 hour, 30 minutes)

In this session the Evaluation Planning Committee will become familiar with and make decisions on four major issues in the evaluation of educators (see Tasks 1-4 in the booklet "II. Guidelines for Planning"):

1. Goals of evaluation
2. Criteria for evaluation
3. Persons to establish and apply specific criteria for evaluation
4. Sources of evaluation data.

Should the Committee be unable to reach a consensus on any of the four issues, a vote on a particular issue may be necessary. Each member, with exception of the chairman, has one vote. The Committee must abide by the majority decision, though if more than one member holds a given dissenting view, a minority statement can be included in the final report.

At the end of this session, when all committees have made decisions on all four issues, there will be a substantial break, possibly for lunch, but not less than 20 minutes.

Planning Session II

(1 hour, 30 minutes)

The Simulation Director will open this session with a review of the purposes of the simulation, the relationship between Planning Session I and Planning Session II, and brief instructions for this session.

The decisions the Committee made in Session I provide the basis for selection during this session of an evaluation system(s) for Dover City. For this session, participants will be provided descriptions of several different systems of teacher

evaluation in the resource booklet entitled "IV. Evaluation Systems." Each committee member will select (or the chairman will assign him) a system to analyze and report on to the rest of the Committee. The Committee should:

1. Analyze each system in terms of its process, cost, time requirements, and appropriateness to the goals, criteria, and other decisions made in the first session.

2. Select no more than two systems that fit its goals and other assumptions, are feasible, given time and cost, and are likely to be received favorably by the Teachers Association and the Board of Education.

If members of the Committee are aware of an alternate system, one that is not presented in the resource booklet, they have the option of studying and adopting it. However, any alternate system considered will need to be described at the same level of detail, including estimated time requirements and cost of implementation, as the systems presented in the booklet.

This session will be divided into two segments, and committees will be paired. The recorder for one planning committee will make a brief presentation to members of the opposite-number committee. The presentation will include:

1. Decisions made on goals, criteria, persons to be involved, and data gathering.
2. Choice of and rationale for selection of an evaluation system(s).

The opposite-number committee will then raise questions in such a way that it causes the other committee to defend its decisions and instrument selection. After 15 minutes, the first report/critique will be ended and committees will switch procedure. In this way a critique of the work of both committees will be accomplished.

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

(30 minutes)

As a final activity, the Simulation Director will lead a discussion by raising questions related to (a) the clarification of issues through the simulation decision-making process, and (b) follow-up suggested by the activity. Participants will be expected to be fully involved in this discussion and to raise their own unresolved questions and make their own recommendations for follow-up.

PLANNING THE EVALUATION OF EDUCATORS
—A SIMULATION

II. GUIDELINES FOR PLANNING

Goals
Criteria
Personnel Involvement
Data Sources

Division of Instruction and Professional Development
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1201 - 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Copyright © 1972/National Education Association of the United States/All Rights Reserved
NEA Stock Number 381-11996

THE DOVER CITY (+) SCHOOL DISTRICT

123 Fourth Street, Dover City, U.S.A. -- (123) 456-7890 -- I. M. Bosse, Superintendent

February 12, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: Evaluation Planning Committee

FROM: Research Division, Dover City School District

SUBJECT: GUIDELINES ON GOALS, CRITERIA, PERSONNEL INVOLVEMENT, AND DATA SOURCES IN THE EVALUATION OF EDUCATORS

As requested in your memorandum of January 29, the following guidelines have been formulated to assist the Committee in working through major considerations in order to arrive at goals, criteria, involvement of personnel, and data collection for a system of evaluating educators.

The initial section of the guidelines provides a brief summary of some research findings on evaluation that you requested for reference purposes.

The second section is set up in worksheet form as four separate tasks so the Committee can pursue tasks one by one, discussing the issues presented and reaching consensus.

The recorder should note the Committee's major recommendations on the "Summary Report..." form provided.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS ON TEACHER COMPETENCE AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

- At present there is no one set of criteria that is universally acceptable in measuring teacher competence.

- The determining of performance as being inadequate does not necessarily provide effective motivation to change that performance.

- Values held by observers about effective teaching styles are primary determinants of their ratings of classroom behavior.

- In general, supervisory ratings lack both reliability and validity.

- No appreciable relationship exists between rating criteria and pupil learning criteria.

- There is a low but significant correlation between student rating of an instructor and student achievement.

Task No. 1

SELECTING GOALS OF AN EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR EDUCATORS

(Select a combination of no more than two goals.)

	Choice(s)
1. To provide information for making judgments about personnel promotions, reassignments, and tenure.	_____
2. To provide educators with the feedback and support for continuous self-improvement.	_____
3. To motivate all members of the staff to participate in formulating and evaluating instructional programs.	_____
4. To establish evidence for dismissing professionally incompetent educators.	_____
5. To provide information for decisions on in-service training and staff improvement programs.	_____
6. To provide information for continuously assessing the adequacy of school programs, resources, and staff and their past accomplishments.	_____
7. Other goal: _____ _____ _____	_____

Task No. 2

DETERMINING GENERAL CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE

(Select no more than five.)

Choice(s)

1. Degree to which students attain instructional objectives set by the teacher. _____

2. Degree to which students attain instructional objectives set by department or school. _____

3. Degree to which students improve performance on standardized tests. _____

4. Degree to which students behave in ways stated by the school to be appropriate. _____

5. Degree to which students respond favorably to the teacher on predetermined criteria. (A student questionnaire would be one means of gathering information.) _____

6. Educator's personal characteristics.
   a. Deportment
   b. Dress
   c. Aspirations
   d. Other: _____ _____

7. Educator's community activities and service. _____

8. Educator's extracurricular activities. _____

9. Educator's membership and activity in professional association. _____

10. Educator's record on in-service study. _____

11. Other: _____ _____

_____

Task No. 3

DECIDING WHO SHOULD SELECT AND APPLY SPECIFIC SYSTEMS FOR ASSESSING EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE

(Select no more than three.)

	Choice(s)
1. The individual being evaluated (i.e., the individual establishes his own criteria for assessment).	_____
2. The immediate supervisor(s) (department chairman, principal).	_____
3. A group representing the instructional staff.	_____
4. Students.	_____
5. The administrator(s) of the school.	_____
6. The school district superintendent.	_____
7. Others: _____ _____	_____

Task No. 4

IDENTIFYING MAIN SOURCES OF DATA IN THE EVALUATION SYSTEM

(Select no more than three.)

	Choice(s)
1. Classroom observations by supervisor(s).	_____
2. Conferences between teacher and supervisor(s).	_____
3. Self-report from the teachers.	_____
4. Classroom observations by peer(s).	_____
5. Student questionnaire.	_____
6. Student achievement data (either from standardized tests or teacher-made tests).	_____
7. Video- or audiotape recordings of classroom activities.	_____
8. Team of independent, outside evaluators.	_____
9. Other: _____	_____

III. REFERENCE MATERIALS

- Goals and Philosophy of the Dover City School District
- Dover City Teachers Association Policy Statement on Teacher Evaluation
- Contract Statement on Evaluation Committee Between the Dover City Teachers Association and the Dover City Board of Education
- Dover City School District Current Evaluation Procedures
- Dover City School District Classroom Observation Form
- Dover City School District Teacher Evaluation Check Sheet

Division of Instruction and Professional Development
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1201 - 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Copyright © 1972/National Education Association of the United States/All Rights Reserved
NEA Stock Number 381-11996

GOALS AND PHILOSOPHY
OF THE DOVER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Dover City School District has as its most basic objective the continuous development, both academic and personal, of all its students as each is capable. Specifically it aims at:

1. Development of an understanding of the principles underlying a free democratic society and inculcation in all students of a sense of responsibility for carrying out the duties which citizenship in such a society entails.

2. Development of proficiency in fundamental processes: reading, communicating with others, handling figures.

3. Development of sound judgment in solving both social and individual problems, especially those concerned with homemaking and family life.

4. Development of good health and physical fitness.

5. Development of an understanding of the physical world.

6. Development of an appreciation of art, music, literature—in short, of the cultural heritage of the Western world.

7. Development of an understanding of other peoples of the world, both ancient and modern, to the end that prejudice and misconceptions about other cultures may be dissipated.

8. Development of respect for sound scholarship and truth-seeking.
9. Development of a perception of moral values.
10. Development of the ability to think clearly and logically.
11. Development of efficient work and study habits.
12. Development of intellectual curiosity.

13. Development of factual knowledge in the various subject areas for success in vocational life and in advanced education.

The Dover City School District realizes that in a constantly changing world nothing in education can remain static. Therefore, it believes in the importance of experimentation and innovation whenever these can be carried on without the surrender of traditional values.

The importance of a firm foundation for educational growth cannot be over-emphasized. Such a foundation is laid in the home, in the schools, and in all other agencies serving youth. The cooperation of all these—indeed, of the community as a whole—must be enlisted if the school is to achieve the high aims for which it is constantly striving.

Dover City Teachers Association

POLICY STATEMENT ON TEACHER EVALUATION

Submitted to the Dover City Board of Education, July 1971

The resolutions of the Dover City Teachers Association recognize the need for greater responsibility for the direction of the education of our children on the part of members of the teaching profession. A reassessment of the role of the teacher and of teacher evaluation must be made in order to achieve this end. The Evaluation Planning Committee has been charged with the task of recommending a system of evaluation which will release the individual potential of teachers and create a more positive and creative learning environment.

The review of the concepts of performance contracting has stimulated meaningful and productive consideration of the process of education and the role of the teacher in it. Its sharply defined view of predictability and classification has illuminated an important element in the Association's resolutions concerning this new role of teaching—the vital importance of humanism and individuality in the teaching process. Too often we have attempted to create a totally empirical approach to teacher evaluation, though a large part of teacher behavior and the learning process is still a mystery. Certain objective measures can and should be used in evaluation, but we must recognize the validity of the individual subjective perspective of the teaching process and individual differences in style among teachers. The teacher's role is to help the student learn how to learn, to conduct inquiry, to make choices and decisions, to know himself and others, to use technology, and to live with change. In order to accomplish these goals, the teacher must use all of the creativity and resourcefulness at his command.

Evaluation should facilitate this process of professional and personal growth of the teacher, as well as provide adequate information for decisions within the context of the school environment. It should be a creative agent in the development of the teacher's perspective, for this growth will ensure a more productive learning environment.

CONTRACT STATEMENT ON EVALUATION COMMITTEE BETWEEN THE DOVER CITY TEACHERS ASSOCIATION AND THE DOVER CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

IX. Evaluation Committee

A system of staff evaluation, including performance criteria, shall be recommended to the Board by an Evaluation Committee established by the Board and the Association.

The Association and the Board shall each appoint, by January 1, 1972, four (4) members to comprise the Committee, with at least two (2) members appointed by the Association being full-time classroom teachers and at least one (1) member of the Board being a member of the Committee.

The Committee shall make an interim report in writing to the Board and the Association by March 15, 1972. The Committee shall make its final recommendation in writing to the Board and the Association by June 15, 1972.

This Article shall expire at the end of the 1971-72 contract year.

Dover City School District

CURRENT EVALUATION PROCEDURES

September 1970

1. The principal shall visit teachers for supervision and evaluation on the following schedule:

   Tenure teachers — 1 time each year
   Probationary teachers — 2 times each year
   Interns — 1 time each year

   Teachers shall be notified at least one week in advance of a visit to their classes.

2. The attached forms shall be used in making evaluation assessments:

   a. Classroom Observation Form
   b. Teacher Evaluation Check Sheet

3. Every teacher shall have the opportunity, on request, to review these documents in his official personnel file.

4. All evaluation reports shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools no later than March 25.

Dover City School District

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM

Teacher observed _____ Date _____ Time _____

Observer _____ Grade level _____

1	2	3	4	5
Poor				Excellent

1. Student interest, response, and attention: _____

2. Teacher-student rapport: _____

3. Lesson presentation: _____

4. Group teaching activities: _____

5. Individual instruction: _____

6. Discipline: _____

7. Room appearance: _____

8. Additional comments: _____

Dover City School District

TEACHER EVALUATION CHECK SHEET

Teacher's name _____ Date _____

	Levels of Performance			
	U	S	E	*
I. PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIP AND BEHAVIOR				
A. Exemplifies conduct befitting the dignity of the profession				
B. Shows maturity of judgment and emotional balance				
C. Inspires confidence and respect				
D. Cooperates with administrators, supervisors, and other teachers				
E. Maintains acceptable personal appearance and health				
F. Participates in community activities and projects				
II. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE				
A. Participates in professional organizations such as DCEA, SEA, NEA				
B. Utilizes opportunities for growth in service				
C. Approaches teaching with an attitude indicative of a career				
D. Attempts to sell and defend education				
III. EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES				
A. Teaches and makes basic skills meaningful.				
B. Employs educational devices beyond the basic text				
C. Recognizes basic needs of individuals and of the group				
D. Employs good guidance techniques in stimulating pupil growth and understanding				

IV. ORGANIZATION OF SUBJECT MATTER				Levels of Performance			
				U	S	E	*
A. Formulates close and long-range objectives							
B. Plans daily fulfillment of objectives							
C. Maintains high interest through good motivation							
D. Gains pupil growth through purposeful activities							
E. Continuously evaluates the total learning process . . .							
V. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT							
A. Creates wholesome classroom atmosphere.							
B. Develops desirable personal relationships with children .							
C. Attempts to make classroom attractive, convenient, and comfortable							
D. Gives attention to details of school business							

* U = Unsatisfactory. S = Satisfactory. E = Excellent.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION: Professional status_____
Probationary status_____
Should not be retained_____

Signature of Principal _____

Signature of Teacher _____

PLANNING THE EVALUATION OF EDUCATORS
—A SIMULATION

IV. EVALUATION SYSTEMS

Division of Instruction and Professional Development
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1201 - 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Copyright© 1972/National Education Association of the United States/All Rights Reserved
NEA Stock Number 381-11996

THE DOVER CITY (+) SCHOOL DISTRICT

123 Fourth Street, Dover City, U.S.A. - (123) 456-7890 - I. M. Bosse, Superintendent

March 1, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: Evaluation Planning Committee

FROM: Research Division, Dover City School District

RE: Evaluation Systems

We have received the summary of goals, criteria, persons to select and apply specific systems, and sources of data for a staff evaluation program for Dover City along with your request for brief descriptions of teacher evaluation systems.

The accompanying document provides descriptions of seven evaluation systems. Obviously there are many other systems that might be included, and if the Committee feels that other systems should be considered, they have the option of considering them. The estimated costs and time requirements are necessarily tentative. They are provided so that the Committee will have a rough gauge of the relative requirements for implementing the systems described.

The Board of Education and the Teachers Association have recommended that you select the system(s) that will best implement your plan and forward your decision to us.

TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEMS

	Estimated Cost*	Choice
1. Interaction Ingredients	$2,150	_____
2. Student Feedback	$1,300	_____
3. Professional Appraisals System	$2,000	_____
4. Teacher Profile	$1,000	_____
5. Assessment of Instructional and Learning Roles	$1,150	_____
6. Observation Guide and Record Form	$1,550	_____
7. Comprehensive Objective Assessment	$6,700	_____
8. Rating Scale for Supervisors and Managers	$3,100	_____

*Consider estimate as the total cost per unit wherein evaluation system will be used. A unit could range from one building or a limited number of buildings to an entire school district, depending on the size of the district.

1. INTERACTION INGREDIENTS

Interaction Ingredients has three major goals:

- To improve interpersonal interaction between teachers and pupils.
- To improve instructional behavior for a more effective learning environment.
- To create a tangible identification of verbal aspects of teacher behavior for general professional growth.

Interaction Ingredients assumes that classroom behavior can be adequately identified through the observation and interpretation of the verbal interaction between instructor and pupils. This verbal interaction is classified in ten categories, for example: "Praises and encourages"; "Student talk—response"; "Criticizing or justifying authority"; "Asks questions" (teacher). Every 3 seconds the verbal interaction is monitored by an observer and recorded in one of these categories. At the end of the instructional period, a matrix of this interaction is developed and the instructor is given feedback concerning the classroom interaction through an analysis of the matrix. A typical set of data from this matrix describes the verbal interaction in the following format:

T e a c h e r	Category 1 (Accepts feeling)	2.1%
	Category 2 (Praises and encourages)	2.9%
	Category 3 (Accepts ideas)	20.0%
	Category 4 (Asks questions)	30.8%
	(etc.)	

Also, the percent of teacher talk, student talk, and silence is identified through the matrix. A high degree of reliability can be achieved with Interaction Ingredients.

Training for Implementation

Five days of in-service training and orientation are necessary for implementation of this system: one day of general orientation for the system's function, two days of workshops for the training in its actual use, and two days of reliability training.

Trained consultants are required to run the workshop and orientation sessions.

Special Resources Required

In order to monitor the classroom interaction, an observation mechanism is necessary. This may be a trained observer from inside or outside the staff, or it may be a mechanical monitoring mechanism such as a video- or audiotape recorder.

Estimated Time Requirement for Application

Each teacher should be observed a minimum of four times during a semester, with a follow-up conference. This implies an average time minimum of fourteen periods per teacher per semester.

1. Training	10 periods
2. Observing	4 periods
3. Coding and analysis	2 periods
4. Conferences	
a. As observer	4 periods
b. As teacher observed	4 periods
	24 periods for first semester

Estimated Cost

For the first year of implementation and operation:

Consultants	$ 900
Training materials	150
Equipment (optional)	1,100
Total	$2,150

2. STUDENT FEEDBACK

Student evaluation systems have three main objectives:

- To give the teacher knowledge of how students view him.
- To give the teacher context understanding of the student population.
- To give the teacher reliable feedback concerning his effect on students for use in the students' own personal growth and interpretation.

Considerable research over the past fifty years has demonstrated that student evaluation of teacher competence is a useful, convenient, reliable, and valid means of evaluation and improvement.

At the middle or end of the semester, the teacher gives to the students a questionnaire for ascertaining student opinion. The data from this questionnaire are compiled and analyzed and the results are returned to the teacher for his use.

The questionnaire includes items that produce information about student impressions of the teacher in terms of knowledge, attitudes, and behavior. While specific items reflect and depend upon philosophy and goals for specific situations, typical items are:

1. Knowledge of subject (Does he have a thorough knowledge and understanding of his teaching field?)
2. Clarity of presentation (Are ideas presented at a level which you can understand?)
3. Fairness (Is he fair and impartial in his treatment of all students in the class?)

Training for Implementation

Training required for implementation of this system is minimal. Two days are sufficient for orientation on the application of tests, processing mechanisms, and using results for self-improvement.

The mechanics for scoring and generating reports must be developed (digital sheets and computer printouts), or such service may be purchased.

Special Resources Required

1. Test items and test format.
2. Processing mechanism.

Estimated Time Requirement for Application

The student evaluation system requires very little time. Teachers administer the student questionnaires during class time, and data processing can be done by computer. Teachers review their own results and share them with others at their discretion.

Estimated Cost

Consultants	$ 200
Orientation	100
Materials	400
Data Processing	600
Total	$1,300

3. PROFESSIONAL APPRAISALS SYSTEM

The Professional Appraisals System (PAS) has three major goals:

- To increase involvement of instructional personnel in the development of department, building, and school system goals and programs.
- The integration of personal and professional goals of the instructional staff with the goals of the department, building, and school system.
- The identification and attainment of goals, with supervisory help, to improve the effectiveness of staff educators.

PAS is a program of supervision and support aimed at facilitating staff improvement. Teachers, supervisors, and administrators interact in setting precisely defined goals in a continuing program of self-renewal. The process is one in which teachers, administrators, and school board members jointly identify common goals, establish criteria for goal attainment, define each individual's major responsibilities for goal attainment, and use these measures as guides for assessing the competencies and contributions of each member of the organization.

Under PAS, goals are explicitly stated for each individual and the measure of attainment is defined in observable terms. Staff members are provided released time for setting goals, developing objectives, and evaluating. Administrators and supervisors have clearly defined roles for assisting staff, and they become accountable on this basis.

Each supervisor, administrator, and teacher must be fully aware of the situational requirements of his area of responsibility and set goals that:

1. Interlock with goals at a higher level.
2. Can reasonably be attained, given the available resources.

Training for Implementation

August: Building and school system administrators, with representatives of the board and the teachers organization, work out the goals applicable for the entire school district.

September: At the building level, the principal, department heads, and representatives of the teachers organization define school goals and fix criteria for accountability.

October: At the departmental level, each teacher negotiates with the department head his own goals for a semester-long period. He works out the criteria by which he will report his attainment of these goals and arranges for the support he requires.

(It should be noted that this system, once implemented, will greatly increase the amount of information on goals, as each person is accountable for providing services to those he supervises and to those with whom he negotiates his own goals.)

Estimated Time Requirement for Application

1. Training in goal setting (two 3-hour workshops for all personnel, in September)	6 periods
2. Released time for goal setting and negotiation (2 hours per week for each member of the instructional staff, in September and January)	8 periods
3. Released time for support of staff during the semester (1 hour per teacher per week)	15 periods
4. Assessment conferences (2 hours per teacher at end of the semester)	4 periods
	33 periods per teacher for first semester

Estimated Cost

Consultants	
a. Orientation	$ 500
b. Workshops	1,000
c. Follow-up	500
Total (for first year)	$2,000

Additional Notes

PAS involves no instrumentation or observation scheme. Therefore, each teacher will be responsible for providing his own means of assessment, with the help of the supervisor and perhaps his peers.

PAS must be implemented as a total plan of goal setting and evaluation and is inappropriate as a system that would involve only evaluation of teachers.

PAS begins with the assumption that there is no current way of establishing a single set of criteria for teacher or educational effectiveness. A second assump-

tion is that telling a person he is performing inadequately does not provide either the motivation or the means for self-improvement. Finally, PAS assumes that the role of authoritative judge and counselor is not viable in a contemporary organizational context. It seeks to join teacher, supervisor, and administrator in a common venture.

4. TEACHER PROFILE

The Teacher Profile is a systematic method of evaluating instructional staff against criteria jointly arrived at by the school administration and the teachers. It is intended to provide information that will assist the school in making decisions about personnel promotion, transfer, and dismissal. Through conferences conducted after classroom evaluation, each teacher has the opportunity of exploring new approaches to his teaching with trained supervisors.

Training for Implementation

A committee of teachers and administrators meet to decide on criteria for evaluating staff effectiveness. Sample criteria:

1. The teacher recognizes and meets individual needs of pupils.
2. The teacher guides classroom procedures toward achievement of class purposes.
3. The teacher shows ability to evaluate the teaching situation and to assist pupils in assessing progress.
4. The teacher gives encouragement and provides opportunities for pupils to make generalizations and develop concepts.
5. The teacher motivates pupils to learn.
6. The teacher contributes to a good emotional climate for learning.
7. The pupils show positive reaction to the learning situation.

Observers (department heads and building principals) are trained, and monthly meetings are scheduled for the purpose of studying common problems and improving reliability of methods and procedures.

Four observations are made per year, each with an observer-teacher conference following. The training for classroom observation includes:

1. Understanding criteria.
2. How criteria are to be used.
3. Observation and trial with films.
4. Methods and processes for objectively recording (via notes) observations:
   a. Setting—teacher, date, time, place, class size, pupils, subject, grade, physical conditions.

b. Teacher behavior—content, process, diagnostic, nonverbal-implied expectations of pupils.

c. Pupil behavior—verbal, nonverbal, level of commitment.

d. General activities—type of lesson, methods, changing activities.

e. No personal judgments.

5. Methods of post-observation conferences:

   a. Set up time and place that is convenient and comfortable.

   b. During conference:

      (1) Review notes and obtain verification from the teacher.
      (2) Go over criteria.
      (3) Go over evaluation on basis of criteria.
      (4) Work out recommendations and put in writing.
      (5) Both sign form.

Estimated Time Requirement for Application

1. Workshop for observers, one full day	6 periods
2. Monthly meetings of observers	3 periods
3. Released time for observers	4 periods (av.)
4. Conference periods for teachers observed	2 periods
	15 periods

Estimated Cost

Consultants	
a. Workshop with observers	$ 500
b. Criteria development	500
Total	$1,000

Additional Notes

It is important to take into account that the observer is the person who records and transmits evaluative information to those making personnel decisions.

5. ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND LEARNING ROLES

The Assessment of Instructional and Learning Roles (AILR) is a process aimed at improving both student and staff behavior by focusing on the roles both teachers and students play in the learning setting. The twenty-nine described in this evaluation system relate to four principal objectives:

1. Individualization of instruction.
2. Close interpersonal relations among pupils and between pupils and teachers.
3. Stimulation of creativity and divergency of thinking.
4. Stimulation of effective group activities.

Each role, representing a style that characterizes the interaction of teacher and students, relates to one of these four goals. These roles are drawn from extensive literature on learning and on the testimony of specialists in the field; in short, the roles describe what, in the best authoritative judgment, should go on in the classroom.

Both student and teacher behaviors are described in a single role. It is obvious that the teacher's behavior is highly important to the learning process in the classroom, laboratory, or study center. What is not recognized by most systems of instructional assessment is that the student's role is highly important as well. It is a well-established principle of psychology that learning does not occur without effort and participation on the part of the learner. Consequently, the student's behavior is an integral part of the role descriptions.

Role examples follow.

Role No. 14: Acceptance of Group Purposes

STUDENTS

...accept purposes established by the group

...rather than submit to factionalism that divides the efforts and purposes of the group.

For example:

The teacher was in the laboratory, but when the students entered no orders were given. Students knew what procedure had been agreed upon. They got out equipment, set it up, and in a few minutes everybody was at work.

Please contribute an example here if you observe one as good as or better than the example given:

TEACHER

...accepts alternative objectives proposed by students

...rather than insisting upon a preplanned program.

For example:

The teacher said, "What you suggest sounds like a good idea. What kind of plan could we make, then, that we could all agree to?"

Role No. 23: Testing Ideas

TEACHER

...encourages the examination, comparison, and testing of different ideas

...rather than depending upon a single authority.

For example:

A student had drawn all his material for a report from an issue of a national news magazine. The teacher raised some questions, such as: "I wonder if other news magazines and newspapers would support these conclusions? Do you remember reading an editorial in our own daily paper on this subject? What about the network news programs?" It turned out that the student did remember seeing and hearing other points of view, and the discussion that followed was able, with the help of other students, substantially to modify some of the conclusions previously presented.

Please contribute an example here if you observe one as good as or better than the example given:

STUDENTS

...are skillful in examining and comparing sources of information

...rather than taking all printed or broadcast material at face value.

For example:

A student took issue with something in the current problems textbook and thought the authors must be biased. Another student pointed out that the text they were using was five years old. Another student suggested consulting the news index for the year in which the book was published: "Maybe this was the prevailing opinion at the time the book was written." "Good idea," said another, "but we'd better look seven years back. It takes about two years, you know, for an author's manuscript to get into print."

The AILR is used to help the individual teachers and students identify appropriate roles. Then a trained colleague observes the teacher's classroom at designated times and records behaviors consistent with the chosen role or roles. In a conference following the observation, the teacher and observer (or teacher, students, and observer) discuss the observation and jointly arrive at strategies for improving student and teacher performance.

By using videotapes and films of master teachers, a teacher can both create and view models of the roles so that he will have concrete examples toward which to strive. If desired, a scoring scale can be developed for rating teachers and students on numbers of roles played.

Training for Implementation

Orientation and training sessions can be accomplished in a single day. A consultant who is well-versed in the instrument is required for training.

Special Resources Required

1. Role description booklet.
2. Training film which focuses on both student and teacher behavior in the learning setting.

Estimated Time Requirement for Application

A minimum of four class visits and follow-up conferences per semester are recommended.

1. Training workshop	6 periods
2. Released time for observations	4 periods
3. Conferences	
a. As observer	4 periods
b. As teacher observed	4 periods
	18 periods per teacher per semester

Estimated Cost

Materials	$ 150
Orientation and training	1,000
Total	$1,150

Additional Notes

In its pure form, AILR is not an instrument with high reliability. Rather, it helps teachers focus on new possibilities for instructional behavior. But it does hold considerable promise for adaptation for more precise measurement.

6. OBSERVATION GUIDE AND RECORD FORM

The Observation Guide and Record Form (OGARF) is a systematic observation process for measuring classroom behavior. It is designed to facilitate four main objectives:

- To provide instructional personnel with comprehensive feedback concerning the total instructional environment for general personal and professional growth.
- To diagnose specific weak areas for instructional management decisions.
- To provide a basis for supervisory diagnosis and personnel decisions.
- To improve the learning environment.

OGARF monitors many dimensions of classroom behavior. The categories used in analysis for OGARF are Differentiation, Social Organization, Initiative, Content, Variety, Competency, and Classroom Climate. Typical items are: "Appeared uncertain of self in classroom"; "Teacher domination"; "Single-text content." These categories and items have been chosen from extensive research and have a high reliability.

A trained observer visits the classroom approximately five times per semester. During this time he monitors the classroom behavior according to the items and categories mentioned above. These data can be summarized and condensed, then used for diagnosis.

Training for Implementation

Training and orientation are required to implement the analysis of OGARF information in instructional management. The two components are:

1. The training of observers in necessary monitoring skills. This would entail the training of a group of six observers in an 11-day program of orientation, workshops, simulation, and reliability testing. Observers must gain interpretive skills in order to identify behavioral modes and monitoring skills for use of the OGARF classification.

2. The orientation and training of supervisory and instructional personnel in analysis of OGARF data. This would entail training all relevant personnel in a 2-day program of orientation and workshop activities. This could be done during the first two in-service days of the year.

Consultants would be needed for the operation of these training sessions.

Estimated Time Requirement for Application

OGARF will involve approximately the same time commitment as the Interaction Ingredients system, though more initial training and orientation time is required.

1. Orientation	3 periods
2. Training	10 periods
3. Observations	4 periods
4. Coding and analysis	2 periods
5. Conferences	
a. As observer	4 periods
b. As teacher observed	4 periods
	27 periods for first semester

Estimated Cost

Consultants	$ 800
Training	750
Total	$1,550

Additional Notes

Classroom observation is a key function in this system. The categories and items are complex, and rapid, accurate analysis of classroom behavior is necessary for monitoring the items and categories.

7. COMPREHENSIVE OBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT

The Comprehensive Objective Assessment (COA) system has four main objectives:

- To give continual feedback concerning student progress on all objectives in the course.
- To give instructional personnel considerable freedom in curriculum design and instructional methodology.
- To provide a comprehensive and reliable framework for personnel decisions.
- To provide information necessary for decision making by instructional personnel in curriculum refinement and methodological effectiveness.

COA is a unique and systematic psychometric procedure for periodic assessment of student performance and course and curriculum evaluation. The major components of COA are longitudinal testing, item sampling, and behavioral objectives. A set of reliable behavioral objectives and related test items are developed by teachers and then stored on computer for easy access by instructional staff. Teachers create the curriculum for their programs by choosing behavioral objectives which adequately incorporate their learning goals. Then the computer generates a series of tests which covers all these objectives. The results are fed back into the computer, which generates reports concerning individual and group performance on each objective. Thorough pre- and posttesting and retention testing related to the objectives create the necessary information for computer reports concerning trends in achieving the objectives throughout the learning experience.

With these data, the teacher can make a variety of decisions such as what to reteach, to omit, to resequence, to modify, to expand, or to teach next. Supervisory diagnosis concerning teacher effectiveness can also be made reliably with this continual feedback on student achievement of all the objectives of an educational program.

Training for Implementation

These two major areas of concern need to be approached in the implementation of the COA system:

1. Solidification and organization of data logistics. This entails the arrangement for computer use, the process of collecting data, and the process of returning reports to instructional personnel. Arrangement for mistakes in the procedure must be made.

2. The training of all related personnel in setting objectives, testing, and interpreting results.

Because of COA's fundamentally different psychometric characteristics and the complexity of its data logistics, implementation entails a major training program. This program should consist of:

1. Orientation sessions
2. Workshops in setting objectives, testing, and interpreting computer output.

Eight days are needed for this training and should be found by raising the number of in-service days and by negotiating for the remainder.

Special Resources Required

1. Computer time for data banking and processing.
2. Computer software for testing, data collection, processing, and report generation.

Estimated Time Requirement for Application

Following a high investment in training, COA requires relatively little time to apply. The only significant activity required is teacher-supervisor conferences. A minimum of two conferences per semester are recommended, averaging four periods per semester per teacher.

Estimated Cost

The cost for the first year of program implementation and operation is estimated at:

Consultants	$ 600
Training	2,000
Data processing	4,100
Total	$6,700

THE PURDUE RATING SCALE FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND EXECUTIVES

H. H. Remmers and R. L. Hobson

Instructions: You are asked to rate your administrator on the following scale. Your ratings will be anonymous —the administrator will never know how you personally appraised him; he will receive only the average responses of all those who rate him. Read the items carefully. Decide which of the five possibilities best describes your administrator. Place the number corresponding to your choice in the blank at the right.

Name of person being rated_____

I. INTELLECTUAL BALANCE

1. Possesses general knowledge:
   (5) Very broad (4) Fairly broad (3) Limited (2) Very limited (1) Lacking..... ____ 1
2. Possesses specific knowledge in his own field:
   (5) Up-to-date (4) Good (3) Fair (2) Poor (1) Lacking..... ____ 2

II. EMOTIONAL BALANCE

3. Is emotionally poised and calm:
   (5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never..... ____ 3
4. Has adequate self-confidence:
   (5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never..... ____ 4
5. Is concerned with his own personal problems:
   (5) Never (4) Seldom (3) Sometimes (2) Usually (1) Always..... ____ 5
6. Welcomes differences in viewpoint:
   (5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never..... ____ 6

III. ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

7. Welds staff into a unit with clearly recognized goals:
   (5) Exceptionally well (4) Very well (3) Quite well (2) Poorly (1) Very poorly..... ____ 7
8. Uses democratic procedures wherever possible:
   (5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never..... ____ 8
9. Inspires subordinates to independent creative work:
   (5) Always (4) Sometimes (3) Seldom (2) Never (1) Makes creative work repulsive..... ____ 9

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE PLANNING

10. Makes plans carefully and adequately:
    (5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never..... ____10
11. Is alert to recognize or devise useful innovations:
    (5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never..... ____11
12. Understands the objectives and interrelationships of his entire work:
    (5) Exceptionally well (4) Very well (3) Quite well (2) Poorly (1) Very poorly..... ____12
13. Does a good job of systematizing and coordinating units of work:
    (5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never..... ____13
14. Has knowledge of pertinent details of his subordinates' work:
    (5) Very good (4) Good (3) Fair (2) Poor (1) Not at all..... ____14

V. USE OF FUNDS

15. Employs as capable personnel as possible:
    (5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never..... ____15
16. Selects equipment wisely:
    (5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never..... ____16
17. Makes effective effort to obtain funds for self-improvement of subordinates:
    (5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never..... ____17

Copyright 1950 THE PURDUE RESEARCH FOUNDATION

PURDUE UNIVERSITY, Lafayette, Indiana

VI. CAPACITY FOR WORK

18. Works hard:
(5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never ____18

19. Welcomes additional responsibilities:
(5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never ____19

20. Meets emergencies in his work competently:
(5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never ____20

VII. ACCOMPLISHMENT

21. Conducts his work as expeditiously as possible:
(5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never ____21

22. The essential work of his organization gets done on time:
(5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never ____22

23. The important work of his organization is completed:
(5) All of it (4) Most (3) Some (2) Little (1) None ____23

VIII. RELATIONS WITH SUBORDINATES

24. Compliments and thanks his subordinates appropriately and sincerely:
(5) Very frequently (4) Quite frequently (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Often criticizes negatively ____24

25. Is available to counsel and assist subordinates:
(5) Sufficiently (4) Almost sufficiently (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never ____25

26. Recognizes and rewards meritorious achievement of his subordinates:
(5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never ____26

27. Possesses insight into the problems encountered by his subordinates:
(5) Complete (4) Much (3) Some (2) Little (1) None ____27

28. Is honest and dependable in dealings with subordinates:
(5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never ____28

29. Displays unwarranted favoritism to some subordinates:
(5) Never (4) Seldom (3) Sometimes (2) Often (1) Continuously ____29

30. Appropriates ideas and work of subordinates to improve his own standing:
(5) Never (4) Seldom (3) Sometimes (2) Often (1) Continuously ____30

31. Does everything possible, consistent with a subordinate's ability and achievement to advance him:
(5) Always (4) Usually (3) Seldom (2) Never (1) Curbs advancement ____31

32. Is just and considerate in discharging subordinates:
(5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never ____32

33. The general morale of his staff:
(5) Exceptionally high (4) Good (3) Fair (2) Poor (1) Very low ____33

IX. PUBLIC RELATIONS

34. Promotes public relations:
(5) Actively good (4) Fair (3) Poor (2) Not at all (1) Actively bad ____34

X. SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

35. Attempts to orient his work to the welfare of society at large:
(5) Exceptionally well (4) Well (3) Fairly well (2) Indifferently (1) Poorly ____35

36. Team work: conforms to the purposes and plans of the organization which he serves: does not seek unfair advantage for his unit:
(5) Always (4) Usually (3) Sometimes (2) Seldom (1) Never ____36

Copyright 1950 THE PURDUE RESEARCH FOUNDATION

PURDUE UNIVERSITY, Lafayette, Indiana

Team #_____ March 13, 1972

SUMMARY REPORT OF PROPOSED EVALUATION PLAN FOR DOVER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

(Committee should complete this form prior to presentation.)

1. Goals of the Dover City Evaluation System

2. Criteria Acceptable for Assessing Educator Performance

3. Who should select and apply specific systems for assessing performance?

4. Sources of Data in the Evaluation System

5. Evaluation System(s) Selected, and Rationale